

**REMARKS**

This amendment is responsive to the Final Office Action dated May 20, 2003. In order to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 1, and cancelled claims 16-20, 24 and 25 without prejudice to place the claims in a condition for allowance. The amendment should require no additional search or consideration of new issues in view of Applicants' currently pending claims. In particular, Applicants have amended claim 1 to include elements of independent claim 16, now cancelled. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request entry of this amendment. Claims 1-14 remain pending.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and 35 U.S.C. § 103**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-2 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Saito et al. (US 6,402,529), and rejected claims 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Klatt et al. (US 6,097,605). In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 3-14, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saito et al. in various combinations with Schmidt et al. (US 5,901,049), Itou et al. (US 6,010,066), Seeley et al. (US 6,132,223), and Klatt et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections to the extent such rejections may be considered applicable to the claims as amended. The applied references fail to disclose or suggest the inventions defined by Applicants' claims, and provide no teaching that would have suggested the desirability of modification to arrive at the claimed invention. Withdrawal of these rejections is requested.

With respect to claim 1 as amended, the cited references fail to teach or suggest an apparatus having a housing that defines a slot to receive one of a plurality of types of removable memory cards, wherein the slot includes a central region of at least a height and a width to receive an entire memory card selected from a set comprising at least three different types of memory cards of at least two different widths, and outer regions of a second height that extend the central region to a width to receive a memory card of a fourth type, as required by claim 1.

For example, in rejecting these elements of claim 16, now cancelled, the Examiner cited Klatt et al. In particular, the Examiner relied on FIG. 4 of Klatt et al., and stated that FIG. 4

illustrates a housing defining a slot having a central region of a height and a width to receive a memory card selected from a set comprising three different types of memory cards of at least two different widths. It appears, however, that the Examiner misinterpreted FIG. 4 of Klatt et al. Specifically, Klatt et al. states that FIG. 4 illustrates "different designs of slot receptacles for different multi media cards."<sup>1</sup> Klatt et al. further states that FIG. 4 "shows different possibilities of embodying the insertion slots."<sup>2</sup> In other words, FIG. 4 of Klatt et al. shows different possible slots that can be used to receive different media cards. FIG. 4 does not show a slot having a central region of a height and a width to receive a memory card selected from a set comprising three different types of memory cards of at least two different widths, as required by Applicants' claim 1 as amended.

None of the other references address these deficiencies of Klatt et al. For example, Saito et al., the primary reference relied upon by the Examiner, describes a card connector in which a housing defines a central region and an outer region. However, the card connector of Saito et al. is only capable of receiving three different types of memory cards. In particular, the card connector described by Saito is only capable of receiving cards that are of the following types: (1) "1-stage thickness," (2) "2-stage thickness," and "thin type."<sup>3</sup> Contrary to Applicants' claims, the central region receives the cards of 1-stage thickness type and 2-stage thickness type, i.e., only two different types of memory cards. Moreover, these types of cards received by the central region have the same overall width.<sup>4</sup>

For at least these reasons, the Examiner has failed to establish a prima facie case for non-patentability of Applicants' claims 1-14, as amended. Withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

### CONCLUSION

All claims in this application are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt allowance of all pending claims. Please charge any

---

<sup>1</sup> Column 4, ll. 27-28.

<sup>2</sup> Column 5, ll. 60-61.

<sup>3</sup> See FIGS. 7-9 and related description.

<sup>4</sup> See FIGS. 7 and 8.

additional fees or credit any overpayment to deposit account number 09-0069. The Examiner is invited to telephone the below-signed attorney to discuss this application.

Date:

7/22/3

By:



Name: Eric D. Levinson

Reg. No.: 35,814

IMATION CORP.

1 Imation Place

Oakdale, MN, 55128

Tel (651) 704-3604

Fax (651) 704-5951

edlevinson@imation.com

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 22 2003

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800